

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 12, 23, and 36 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-12, 14-28, and 30-37 are now pending in this application.

The present application was originally filed on December 21, 2001 with 32 claims. On August 27, 2002, a preliminary amendment was filed in which additional claims 33-35 were added. A second preliminary amendment was filed on September 24, 2003. In the second preliminary amendment, claim 1 was amended to eliminate an ambiguity in the claim language, and new claims 36 and 37 were added.

On October 6, 2003, the Examiner issued a first Official Action. However, the Examiner had yet to receive the September 24, 2003 preliminary amendment, in which a number of the issues raised by the Examiner had already been corrected. The Examiner subsequently agreed to reexamine the claims in light of the September 24, 2003 preliminary amendment. A new Official Action was issued on December 10, 2003, vacating the October 6, 2003 Official Action.

The Office Action of December 10, 2003 rejected claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 12-21, 23-28, 31 and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,768,177, issued to Thomas, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,511,472, issued to Taylor, and U.S. Publication No. 2002/009695, in the name of Rasheed et al.

On May 20, 2004, the Examiner issued a Final Office Action. Claims 1-9, 12-21, 23-28, 31, and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Taylor, Rasheed et al., and Shimizu et al. Claims 10, 11, 22, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Taylor and Rasheed et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,354 issued to Carbone. Claims 23, 28-30, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,309,825 issued to Geddes.

A telephonic interview was held July 20, 2004, between Mr. Marshall Brown, Mr. Matt Martin, Examiner Phong Nguyen, and Primary Examiner Allan Shoap. Claim 1 was discussed. Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner stated that Claim 1 was on the right track. In addition, the Examiner clarified that he considered the templates of the present application to be dies.

Applicants filed a Request for Continued Examination of the present application on August 19, 2004.

On November 18, 2004, the Examiner issued a non-final office action following the Request for Continued Examination. Once again, Claims 1-9, 12, 14-21, 23-28, 30, 31, and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Taylor, Rasheed et al., and Shimizu et al. Claims 10, 11, 22, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Taylor and Rasheed et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,354 issued to Carbone.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of February 9, 2005. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 36 were discussed, but no agreement was reached.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 12, 23, and 36 in accordance with the Examiner's comments in the November 18, 2004 Office Action. The Examiner suggested at Point 4, "including the limitation of a scoring tool to trace a circumference of a shape to form a crisp

embossmment to the existent independent claims to overcome the prior arts." Applicants have added this language to all of the independent claims in the present application.

Because Applicants have amended the claims as the Examiner suggested, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance given the Examiner's statements. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Applicants are submitting this amendment without prejudice and reserve the right to reapproach the issues and rejections in a related application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 18, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 27433  
Telephone: (312) 832-4358  
Facsimile: (312) 832-4700

By Marshall J. Brown

Marshall J. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,566

Matthew E. Martin  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 53,274